



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

QUARTERLY JOURNAL

OF THE

STATISTICAL SOCIETY.

SEPTEMBER, 1861.

*On the ORIGIN and Numerical DEVELOPMENT of SERFDOM in the
RUSSIAN EMPIRE. By M. ARTHUR DE BUSCHEN, of the
Central Commission of Statistics in the Ministry of the Interior,
St. Petersburg.**

[Read before the Statistical Society, by Mr. J. T. Hammack, 23rd April, 1861.]

CONTENTS:

	PAGE		PAGE
I.—The Origin of Serfdom in Russia in the Seventeenth Century.....	312	IV.—Partial Amelioration of the Condition of the Serfs until the Abolition of Serf- dom in 1861	317
II.—Legalization of Serfdom by Peter the Great.....	313	V.—Numerical Survey of Serfdom at the period of the Eman- cipation	319
III.—The further Development of Serfdom to the year 1801	315		

THE project for the complete emancipation of the serfs which has recently attracted the attention of the civilized world, was taken in hand two years ago. That project has become a fact, and the serf population in Russia is now free. Despotism had enslaved the race,

* M. de Buschen, one of the Reporters of the Central Commission of Statistics at St. Petersburg, charged by the Russian Government with the mission of visiting the different States of Europe for the purpose of studying the practical details connected with the organization of their official statistics, having been in England (accompanied by M. Wilson), in order to observe the method of taking the recent census in this country, presented to the Statistical Society this Paper on Serfdom in Russia,—a subject of peculiar interest at the present time. It is proper to observe, that the paper was written by M. de Buschen in German, and that an excellent translation of it was prepared under difficult circumstances, and on a very short notice, by Mr. Clarkson Bradley, second assistant in the office of the Statistical Society; this translation, for which the thanks of M. de Buschen and the Society were publicly given to Mr. Bradley, Mr. Hammack has revised and condensed for publication.—Ed. S. J.

and existed in every pore of the organism of the State, stifling every effort at improvement. By the most resolute determination alone could serfdom be overcome, and rooted out. The Emperor Alexander has displayed greater strength of will than any of his predecessors, who had always yielded to difficulties, and from these first steps will date the political development of Russia. Important reforms in most of the departments of the administration are already in progress, and are being pushed forward with vigour.

Russia occupies the same position that she did at the close of the sixteenth century. Notwithstanding private and official splendour, three hundred years have changed her but little, and have only separated her from progressive Europe. Free labour can alone civilize and enrich a nation, but the Russian peasant has remained up to this time poor and uncivilized.

In the consideration of the gradual rise of serfdom, from the commencement of which date the endless distinctions of rank existing among the whole population, it will be convenient to arrange our remarks under a few heads referring to the more strongly marked periods in its history.

I.—*The Origin of Serfdom in Russia in the Seventeenth Century.*

From the time of the foundation of the Roman Empire until the sixteenth century, every native of Russia was a freeman, whether he dwelt on his own property, or on that of another.

In this respect the Muscovite nation was much in advance of Western Europe, and the people owed their position of personal freedom to its legitimate development. As was the case with nearly all the countries of Western and Central Europe, Russia was founded as a distinct state by foreigners. She owed her primary organization to invasion, but the fact stands almost alone in history, that the invasion was a peaceable one. When the Goths, Lombards, Franks, Northmen, and Saxons overran the old world with the sword, the inhabitants of the great Roman Empire were compelled to cultivate their former possessions for the victors. Then it was that the Northmen made their way into Russia, and received a welcome from the inhabitants. "Our country," said the envoys from Novgorod, "is large and fruitful, but there is no order amongst us; come and be our rulers." This is recorded in the most ancient chronicle of Russia. The Scandinavians thus invited, settled in the land and established monarchy in place of the earlier republics.

No change occurred in the position of the people in connexion with the land, and the agricultural population continued free. It is a common error to suppose that serfdom existed in Russia during the middle ages. This error has arisen from the misinterpretation of historical records. During the middle ages the peasantry were

entirely free; they paid taxes for different purposes, and in many cases rent on land. It is true, that of slaves, in the strict sense of the word, there were a few, but these were for the most part prisoners taken in war, who were delivered over by law to the victors as their personal property. Later, it was lawful to make over insolvent debtors to their creditors as personal property.

No doubt the peasants were seldom freeholders; by far the greater number were tenants cultivating the lands of the great proprietors, or of the monasteries and other institutions. The peasant rendered payment to the State, to the church, or to his lord, according to agreement, always possessing the right to quit the estate at pleasure, and settle elsewhere. Owing to the economic effects resulting from this unshackled right of movement, certain restrictions were imposed in order to secure the cultivation of the land. The peasants were allowed to leave the estate only at stated periods, and their engagements usually terminated on St. George's Day (26th November), after the ingathering of the harvest. This from being at first only a custom, subsequently was made law. The object was to remove, as far as possible, uncertainty in the cultivation of the soil, and consequently in the revenues of the proprietors. This was also of great importance with respect to the crown lands, upon the rents of which partly depended the revenue of the State. Here we have the principal reason which induced the government to limit to this extent the freedom of the peasant, and the first steps taken to attach him to the soil. An edict issued in 1597, compelled him to remain on the land on which he was then dwelling. It was some time, however, ere this measure was fully carried out, only on the accession of the new dynasty of Romanoff, in the year 1613, could it be accomplished, and this important restriction in the liberty of the labouring population be everywhere introduced.

But this law, confirmed by the adhesion of the nobles, the clergy, and those who had special interests in the new organization, although attaching the peasant to the soil, did not deprive him otherwise of his liberty. Even after this decree we are unable to discover anything approaching to the condition of absolute slavery among the peasants, or the bondage of any class amongst them. But the foundations of serfdom as a modern institution were securely laid. The last relics of the early form of slavery disappeared, and the slaves who had been private property were everywhere placed on an equality with the rest.

II.—*Legalization of Serfdom by Peter the Great.*

As the earlier differences in the position of the peasants with regard to taxation remained, a distinction began to be recognised in the rights of those who had settled on different lands and

estates. The peasants who dwelt on the crown lands, denominated crown peasants, formed the largest class; and although nominally free, they became more and more dependent on the government.* The peasants assigned to the monasteries and for the support of the clergy were also distinct, those possessed by the clergy being in total dependence on the church.† Distinct from the general mass, were also those who were held by a species of feudal tenure. Certain inferior nobles held their estates under the obligation of supplying troops, with whom they were bound personally to serve. The vassalage of the peasants continued only so long as the noble fulfilled his obligation to hold himself at the service of the Czar, with horse, weapons, and retainers. The peasants of this class, although greatly dependent on the will of the feudal lord, were allowed to hold land directly from the State. Abuses, however, gradually crept in. The nobles began to exchange their lands with the peasants dwelling thereon, subsequently the sale of servants without land became common, although strictly forbidden by law.

The legal sanction of the power of the lords took place in the latter years of the reign of Peter the Great. The reforms effected by this sovereign in his dominions, and the efforts he made to render Russia a completely organized European State are well known. These reforms, however, especially the establishment of a standing army, demanded large pecuniary resources, and a consequent reconstruction of the financial department of the Empire. The owners of estates, with the abolition of their early feudal obligations, were compelled by law to serve the State either in a civil or a military capacity. On these conditions alone could the nobles enjoy the privileges of their position; they were obliged to guarantee to the State certain taxes and imposts on their property, that is, they were made responsible for the levying of recruits and for the exaction of a poll tax from the people on their estates. In order to determine the amount of this tax, Peter instituted the first census of the population,‡ the payment of each proprietor not being reckoned according to the extent or produce of his property, *but according to the number of souls settled thereon.* The year 1718 commenced, and

* Some of these had special services to perform, like the postmen who lived in particular villages on the great military roads, and in lieu of paying taxes and being subject to conscription, performed the duty of delivering letters. The castle peasants, appointed for the keeping up of the imperial castles, and the peasants whose duty it was to furnish the depôts with salt from the lakes of Astracan, afford other examples.

† The number of these was very important; they were incorporated with the general mass of crown peasants, under Peter the Great, a yearly rent being paid to the church.

‡ Since this first census nine others have been taken at irregular periods; and, like the first, they have been chiefly limited to inquiries respecting the persons liable to taxation and to military duty

the year 1722 completed this measure, and at the same time established the right of the noble to the person of his tenant. The peasant fell into complete personal bondage.

The right to levy recruits and to fix the amount of taxation were enforced without regard to the changes in the number or the occupations of the people ; the law gave the lords the power of holding the tenants absolutely at their command. The sale of the serf with or without the land was permitted. Few rights were reserved to him, but he was still allowed in some cases to acquire property in land, and he might enter the military service at will. When sold he was not to be separated from his family. Yet even these restricted privileges were often infringed.

We find then at the close of the reign of Peter the Great three different classes of peasants. The first, consisting of freemen with property in land, was numerically small. The second class, namely the crown peasants, including those connected with the estates of the monasteries and the church, had largely increased, forming two-thirds of the rural population of Russia. The third class, consisting of serfs cultivating the land of their lords, formed scarcely a third of the whole population.

III.—*The further Development of Serfdom to the Year 1801.*

During the century which followed the death of Peter the Great despotism gradually acquired a firmer hold, and the peasants sank deeper and deeper into bondage. In vain have writers and historians endeavoured to discover any measures of the Government evincing the slightest solicitude for the welfare of the great mass of the people. No gleams of light have penetrated through the moral darkness of the period. Of the eight sovereigns of Russia in the eighteenth century, after Peter the Great, three were emperors, viz., Peter II, who died when a child ; Peter III, deposed after a reign of only six months ; and Paul, who reigned four years ; the rest were empresses, who allowed themselves to be ruled by their favourites, and indeed handed over the government of the country to each succeeding lover.*

Under Peter's successors the peasants soon lost their few remaining privileges. In the year 1729 they were forbidden to take military service of their own freewill. In 1730 an edict was issued recalling the permission to possess and inherit property in land. In 1736 followed a decree authorizing the sale of the serfs *without* the land. In the same year the right of punishing fugitive serfs, which until then belonged only to the State, was vested in the landlords.

* Three of these sovereigns, Anna Leopoldowna, Peter III, and Catherine II, were foreigners ; the last only, in consequence of the length of her reign, became well acquainted with the country.

During the reign of Elizabeth, the daughter of Peter the Great, it was decreed, amongst other regulations on the subject of fugitive serfs, that if any one appropriated a strange serf, or took him as a recruit, the injured proprietor was authorized to take another man from the offender as a substitute. In this and other enactments the serf was regarded as a chattel capable of being replaced by another of the same kind. In 1760 a new edict appeared, which allowed the landlords to send all serfs with whom they were dissatisfied, or who bore their yoke discontentedly, to work in the mines of Nerchinsk, in Siberia, the State making the proprietors an equivalent allowance in fixing their quota of recruits. The wives were compelled to follow their husbands, but the children might be retained by their owners, in other words, the State colonized Siberia by purchasing slaves and separating families. Passing some minor enactments during the short reign of Peter III,* we proceed to notice some of the edicts of the Czarina Catherine II, the especial favourite with the nobles, to whom she owed her crown. Talking much of liberty, her solicitude for the welfare of the serfs was confined to repeated exhortation to their owners to treat them with mild and philosophic consideration, as though such flourishes could set aside positive law. The active measures of Catherine, however, inflicted the severest wounds on freedom, and completed the edifice of which the foundations had been laid by Peter the Great. While at home she enslaved Russia she warmly espoused the cause of the negro slave abroad. Owing her throne to the aristocracy and clergy, or rather to those to whom the German habits of Peter the third had become unbearable, she convened them at Moscow in 1767, to consider the existing laws and the best method of ameliorating the condition of the people. For the guidance of this assembly of notables she herself wrote instructions, drawing her inspiration from the philosophers of the eighteenth century, especially from Voltaire; historic facts, philosophic flourishes, and practical remarks alternate in strange succession; Lacedemon, Athens, Rome, and Peter the Great had to furnish precepts. Her remedies, derived from the books of Mosaic law, and from the history of the ancient and modern world, ill concealed her ignorance of the real position and the grievances of the age in which she ruled. The instructions referred to matters affecting the condition of the labouring population of the state, without, however, treading near the principles of serfdom.† The amendment of some personal grievances, such as the means of

* Peter seems to have been on the whole a well disposed sovereign; his chief fault lay in a disposition to act always according to German customs and ideas, which among the most influential classes in Russia found no response.

† In these instructions the character of Catherine completely reveals itself as it were in a mirror. A lofty spirit, great learning and powers of mind, combined

obtaining redress for cruel treatment of serfs, and concerning freedom of marriage, were discussed but not legally established. The assembly broke up after some grandiloquent orations, without doing anything beneficial to the serfs.

In 1783, Catherine extended serfdom as far as the country of the Cossacks of Ukraine, where it had hitherto been unknown.

In 1785, she published her memorable edict concerning the rights of the nobles with respect to their landed property. In order to secure the favour of the nobility, the rights of the serf population were entirely sacrificed. The aristocracy were granted freedom from State service, and exemption from all personal burdens and taxes; new political rights and privileges were granted them. Among the last was the right of sole and uncontrolled possession of the serfs. The peasant was reckoned as a chattel, and constituted hereditary and disposable property of his lord. All the earlier regulations remained, and were legally confirmed. From this edict dates the first recognition of serfdom in Russia as an institution authorized by law.

The presentation of crown property to private individuals in the time of Catherine was wasteful in the extreme. From the victorious general to the favourite lover every service was rewarded from this never-failing mine of wealth; hence date the estates of Menschikoff, Potemkin, and others. At the close of the eighteenth century the state of the peasant population stood thus—the free peasants dwelling on their own property had absolutely, but not relatively, increased, on account of those in newly acquired provinces, and especially the Crimea, being counted.* The free peasants of the crown lands, owing to their sale or presentation to private individuals, had considerably decreased. The peasants on the property of private proprietors had almost all become serfs, among them several millions of Cossacks of the Don, and Lithuanians, Volhynians, Podolians, &c. The serf system had been extended to not less than two-fifths of the whole population of the Empire, or to fifteen millions out of thirty-five millions of souls.

IV.—*Partial Amelioration of the Condition of the Serfs until the Abolition of Serfdom in the Year 1861.*

The reign of Paul, which occupied the last years of the eighteenth century, if bringing no change for the better, did not at any rate

with a total absence of practical knowledge and fitness for action. She remarks that morality alone sustains and increases the human family. We know well the example of morality she afforded to her court and people.

* In Lithuania, and especially in the provinces where the Poles had spread their dominions, serfdom was more widely spread than in Russia, although in a milder form.

aggravate the position of the serfs. We do not agree with many who ascribe to Paul an increase of 800,000 souls to the serfs. The separation of this number from the ordinary class of crown peasants, as gifts to the members of the imperial family and to the order of knights (1797) instituted no new bondage. The appanage-peasants thus created had a distinct form of government, and must on no account be regarded as ordinary serfs, since they rather resembled the crown peasants in their rights and duties. After the death of Paul earnest efforts were made by his successors, not only to procure better treatment of the serfs, but also to check the increase of serfdom. These efforts were weak indeed, but still produced some effect. The people perceived in them some signs of future liberty. The Russian legislature on this subject presented a multitude of enactments which cannot be analysed here. Suffice it to say that they contained the greatest contradictions. The old ordinances and laws were first rescinded, then restored with greater severity, and then again modified and lightened. On the whole we cannot deny that an inclination for the better prevailed, struggling against the fear of incurring the displeasure of the aristocracy and of exciting liberal ideas and innovations. It is a significant fact, that during the reigns of Alexander I and Nicholas eight commissions were appointed for the purpose of revising and ameliorating the position of the peasants. All these commissions were strictly secret, and led to no decided or vigorous results.

The principal proceedings more recently were these,—a new class of peasants, termed “free husbandmen,” was formed; the enactment of measures for the emancipation of the Baltic provinces, and the limitation of relations of property for preventing an arbitrary augmentation of burdens in the western provinces; the sale of serfs without land was disallowed; the gift of State peasants to private individuals (re-adopted since 1830 under Nicholas) was discontinued, the right of punishment by the lord was limited, and the separation of families prohibited.

The introduction of a class of free husbandmen dates from the year 1803. The landlords were allowed, according to the project of the great Rumianzoff, to free their peasants with a certain quantity of land. Experience should have taught the landlords to perceive the advantage of this course, and to follow it; yet at the present time this class of peasants numbers only 400,000 souls of both sexes.

More important in its results was the emancipation of the Baltic Provinces, which in the year 1804 commenced with an attempt to improve the condition of the serfs in Livonia, and in 1816 and subsequent years ended with their general liberation in all three provinces. The Livonian nobles, invited by the Government to set a good example to other parts of the empire, declared their tenants to

be personally free. A programme was formed for the organization of their mutual relations, and this first measure was afterwards fully carried out in the three provinces. From the present point of view, however, the emancipation of the Baltic Provinces would be regarded as incomplete. At that time it was one of the most important steps ever taken in Russia for the good of the serfs. It secured the personal freedom of the peasants, the right to possess and acquire property in land, and a free power of agreement with the landlords concerning the cultivation of the soil.

At the close of the reign of Alexander I, and at the commencement of that of Nicholas, there was an entire cessation in the prosecution of serf reform. The governing classes were in fear of democracy, then manifesting itself throughout Europe. Somewhat later, the government appears to have laid aside its mistrust and to be willing to forward the work of emancipation. The year 1842 saw introduced a new law recognizing the freedom of the peasant without land, subject to a fixed regulation for taxes and imposts. This new class of freemen, called "conditional peasants," or engaged labourers, numbers only 55,000 souls of both sexes.

The recently announced and all-important project of freeing the serfs has made an end of all further evils consequent upon their bondage. The next two years will mark the period of transition, and upon its termination every serf in Russia will become personally free. The regulations under which the servitude and burdens of the serf population are to be removed will then be fully established. The domestic serfs, that is to say, those without land, will be irrevocably free. The husbandmen obtain their personal liberty, and remain under control, in other respects, only so long as they have no land of their own. The quantity of land which was fixed upon for the usufruct only, and that which was assigned to the serf as part of his wages, will remain unaltered; his interest in the soil will be reserved to him for the payment of a rent or for the performance of personal labour on the property of the landlord. In eight years all payment by labour of this kind is to be discontinued, and payment in *money* is to be substituted. The peasants may buy land as their own free property, and the road to independence is thus opened to them. By the help of these arrangements the relations between landlord and tenant are clearly established.

Russia has greeted with joy these reforms, which have made Alexander the most popular sovereign of all his predecessors. His work is not the mere privilege of a class, as so many previous reforms have been; it is the impartial realization of the principles of truth and justice,—a sure foundation of the growth of a nationality, and of the material and intellectual advance of the empire.

V.—*Numerical Survey of Serfdom in the Russian Empire at the period of the Emancipation.*

We now proceed to present a statistical view of serfdom, at the period of the emancipation. The numbers are derived from the tenth census, taken at the end of the year 1858. The total population of Russia, exclusive of Poland, the Grand Duchy of Finland, and the Caucasus, consisted of 62,000,000. In the following provinces, containing 3,251,000 souls, the serf system had ceased to exist, viz.:—Erstland, Livonia, Kurland, and the country of the Cossacks of the Black Sea, Semipalatinsk, and of the Kirghis, Siberia. The provinces in which serfdom existed, contained a population of 59,000,000, of whom 48,000,000 or nearly four-fifths of the whole were cultivating land and presenting three distinct classes.

1. The freemen possessing land of their own, amounting to only 1,500,000*l*.

2. The free peasants on land belonging to the State, numbering 23,300,000. This class consists of a great number of different denominations, with different rights; they pay "*obrok*" for cultivated land.

3. The serfs belonging to private proprietors, amounting to 22,563,086. They include 36 per cent., or about one-third of the whole population, and two-fifths of the rural population. In 1858, they were sub-divided as follows:—

(a.) Serfs attached to the land:—

Males, of all ages	9,798,938
Females ,, 	10,359,293
Both sexes	<u>20,158,231</u>

(b.) Serfs not attached to the land, but held as the servants of the proprietors:—

Males	723,725
Females	743,653
Both sexes	<u>1,467,378</u>

(c.) Temporary serfs, held for stated periods:—

Males	173,476
Females	180,848
Both sexes	<u>354,324</u>

(d.) Serfs, the property of institutions, as corporations, churches, schools, hospitals, &c., generally legacies from private individuals:—

Males	19,350
Females	21,204
Both sexes	<u>40,554</u>

(e.) Serfs attached to manufactories and mines (mostly belonging to merchants):—

Males	259,455
Females	283,144
	<hr/>
Both sexes	542,599
	<hr/>

These five classes comprise a total of—

Males.....	10,974,944
Females	11,588,142
	<hr/>
Total of both sexes	22,563,086
	<hr/>

The proportion of the sexes is as 100 males to 105 females, whereas the *whole* population is as in the proportion of 100 males to 101 females. The females, therefore, according to the numbers returned, greatly predominate among the serf population, a phenomenon which is partly explained by the concealment of the true number of males (to a small extent it is true), in order to avoid the taxes. The annual levies of recruits, and the greater mortality of the male children born have also diminished the number of males.

The subjoined table (see p. 324) exhibits the distribution of serfs (including women and children) belonging to private proprietors in 1858 throughout the Russian Empire.

Column 2 gives the number of serfs attached to the land in the different governments and provinces.

Column 3 gives us the number of serfs bestowed on the nobles as servants. The largest number of this class will be observed in the Governments of Voronesh, Ekatherinoslaw, Kursk, Orel, Poetewa, Riasan, Tamboff, Toula, Kherson, and Kharkoff. These provinces are for the most part thickly populated, and the number of small proprietors is very considerable.

Column 4 gives the number of temporary serfs, who after a fixed period became free. They are found only in a few governments, and are most numerous in the early Polish provinces. These are the serfs made personally free since 1846 by their landlords, yet the land made over to them, has had to bear taxes, &c., just as though their servitude had continued.

Column 5 gives the distribution of 40,000 serfs, the property of different institutions, such as schools, churches, hospitals, &c. These serfs, although not belonging to individuals, were subject to the directors and heads of the institutions, who exercised all the rights of landlords.

Column 6 gives the distribution of serfs engaged in manufactories and in the mines. They are most numerous where the proportion

of agricultural serfs is smallest as in Perm, Orenburg, Kaluga, and Tamboff. This class originated in the desire of Peter the Great, to encourage industry and the improvement of manufactures.

Column 7 exhibits the total number of serfs, and when compared with the general population in column 10, it affords some interesting results. In sixteen governments 50 per cent. and upwards of the population were in a state of serfdom. Among these are the following belonging to the earlier Polish provinces, viz., Smolensk 70 per cent., Mohileff 64 per cent., Witebsk 57 per cent., Minsk 60 per cent., Podolia 60 per cent., Volhynia 56 per cent., Kieff 58 per cent. Seven governments of Great Russia, forming the centre of the Muscovite Empire, give the following proportions:—Tula 68 per cent., Kaluga 61 per cent., Riäsan 56 per cent., Nijni-Novgorod 58 per cent., Vladimir 57 per cent., Kostroma 57 per cent., and Yaroseaw 57 per cent. Moscow is not counted with these governments, owing to the magnitude of her town population, which is almost entirely free. With the exception of the west, where the Polish rule spread serfdom, and enslaved nearly the whole population, the relative proportion of serfdom decreased according to the distance of the provinces from the centre formed by Moscow and the above-mentioned governments. The proportion of serfs was lowest in the following governments, viz., Tauria (Crimea) 5 per cent., Olonetz 4 per cent., Viatka, Astrakhan, Stawropol 2 per cent., and Bessarabia 1 per cent. The proportion in Siberia is smaller still. Serfdom had been introduced into all these provinces, mostly through the colonisation by peasants from Great Russia, but fortunately had never taken a firm hold.

Column 8 shows the number of proprietors of serfs, and by comparing this with the preceding column (7) we obtain column 9, in which the average number of serfs possessed by each owner is given. This proportion has exercised great influence on the relations of the serfs with their lords. As a rule those belonging to large estates have been better off both as regards their land and other circumstances than those on smaller properties. The table exhibits the districts in which a numerous and mostly poor aristocracy ruled. Unquestionably the richest districts were Perm (with 9,700 serfs as an average to each owner), Viatka (530), and the three lesser Russian Governments of Podolia (670), Kieff (721), and Volhynia (370). The average of the whole country was 211 serfs to each proprietor. Of the 107,000 proprietors, 1,396 were owners of no less than 6,500,000 serfs, or on an average about 4,600 each, principally in the Governments of Kieff; Wolhynia, Podolia, Saratoff, and Nijni-Novgorod; 2,462 proprietors with more than 3,000,000 serfs, had between 1,000 and 2,000 serfs, or about 1,200 on an average to each. This latter class were chiefly in the above-mentioned

absolutely decreased. Since 1851 it has remained almost stationary. Looking at the classes separately we find the number of agricultural serfs had steadily decreased, a circumstance which may be explained by (1) the yearly recruiting, (2) the liberation of serfs given over to other positions, (3) various causes operating against their increase, such as bad treatment, poverty, high rate of mortality, &c. Many proprietors, partly from necessity and partly from the fear of emancipation so continually threatened for twenty years, transferred their serfs from the soil to domestic service, in order not be compelled to make over any of their land to them. Thus an increase of 50 per cent. since

TABLE showing the Distribution of SERFS (including Women and Children)

1	2	3	4	5	6
Governments or Divisions.	Serfs attached to the Land.	Domestic Serfs.	Temporary Serfs.	Serfs belonging to Insti- tutions.	Serfs attached to Manu- factories and Mines.
Archangel	—	20	—	—	—
Astracan	11,848	579	—	—	—
Bessarabia	4,922	5,923	—	—	—
Vilna	368,154	19,305	14,071	1,019	—
Vitebsk	429,692	11,903	3,403	1,235	—
Vladimir	662,541	25,881	—	3,508	7,607
Vologda	207,539	7,613	—	1,126	1,499
Volhynia	686,911	416	176,690	144	—
Voronezh	451,579	65,767	—	420	2,480
Viatka	35,446	1,612	—	—	19,115
Grodno	335,963	13,207	3,988	8,144	—
Don Kosacks	281,109	5,047	—	—	—
Ekatherinoslav	272,235	56,295	—	—	—
Kasan	196,908	15,943	—	—	1,567
Kalouga	556,032	29,665	—	85	36,834
Kieff	1,080,421	7,303	33,338	—	—
Kowno	332,469	14,605	17,572	—	—
Kostroma	485,431	31,754	—	—	498
Koursk	563,311	136,499	—	2,964	21,815
Minsk	546,802	14,434	36,658	1,266	—
Mohileff	556,297	15,183	—	789	—
Moscow	585,911	28,721	—	2,133	4,547
Nijni-Novgorod	711,883	18,600	—	—	12,310
Novgorod	392,940	26,915	—	207	—
Olonetz	10,483	773	—	205	—
Orenburg	125,175	12,244	—	—	99,555
Orel	620,720	87,358	—	1,247	14,703
Pensa	507,314	38,427	—	29	3,960
Perm	367,288	14,152	—	—	277,717
Podolia	968,026	6,306	65,968	751	—

* Excluding

† Excluding

1836 in the class of domestic serfs is accounted for. The same remark applies to the serfs attached to mines and manufactories, whose real increase, however, is not so great as it appears, as they were sometimes counted together with the agricultural serfs. The very striking diminution of serfs belonging to institutions is the result of the abolition of the monasteries and the abrogation of serfdom on the church property of the Western provinces.

Thus, during the last few years, the cause of freedom of the serfs has progressed, and for the first time in 1861 the word "serf" has been for ever blotted out.

in the RUSSIAN EMPIRE belonging to Private Proprietors at the close of 1858.

7	8	9	10	11	12
Total of Serfs.	Number of Proprietors of Serfs.	Average Number of Serfs to each Proprietor.	GENERAL POPULATION.	Percentage of Serfs.	Government or Divisions.
20	3	6·66	274,951	0·007	Archangel
12,427	86	144	477,492	2·60	Astracan
10,844	271	40	919,107	1·17	Bessarabia
402,549	2,096	192	876,116	45·95	Vilna
446,233	1,571	284	781,741	57·08	Vitebsk
692,532	2,659	263	1,207,908	57·91	Vladimir
217,777	1,264	172	951,593	22·89	Vologda
864,161	2,341	369	1,528,328	56·54	Volhynia
520,246	2,632	197	1,930,859	26·94	Voronesh
56,173	106	530	2,123,904	2·64	Viatka
361,302	1,605	225	881,881	40·97	Grodno
286,156	2,911	98	896,870	31·91	Don Kosacks
328,530	2,448	134	1,042,681	31·51	Ekatherinoslav
214,418	907	236	1,543,344	31·89	Kasan
622,616	2,440	255	1,007,471	61·80	Kalouga
1,121,062	1,554	721	1,944,334	57·66	Kieff
364,646	1,547	236	988,287	36·90	Kowno
617,683	3,264	188	1,075,988	57·41	Kostroma
724,589	5,475	132	1,811,972	39·99	Koursk
599,160	1,967	304	986,471	60·74	Minsk
572,269	2,165	264	884,640	64·69	Mohileff
621,312	2,439	254	1,599,808	38·84	Moscow
742,793	1,411	526	1,259,606	58·97	Nijni-Novgorod
420,062	4,261	98	975,201	43·07	Novgorod
11,461	219	52	287,354	3·99	Olonetz
236,974	895	265*	2,007,075	11·81	Orenburg
724,028	3,823	189	1,532,034	47·26	Orel
549,730	2,029	271	1,188,535	46·25	Pensa
659,157	68	9·693†	2,046,572	32·21	Perm
1,041,051	1,554	670	1,748,466	59·54	Podolia

col. 6, only 153.

col. 6, only 5,500.

TABLE showing the Distribution of SERFS

1	2	3	4	5	6
Governments or Divisions.	Serfs attached to the Land.	Domestic Serfs.	Temporary Serfs.	Serfs belonging to Insti- tutions.	Serfs attached to Manu- factories and Mines.
Poltawa	595,760	85,851	—	61	—
Pskoff	360,639	19,526	—	—	—
Riasan	722,225	69,239	—	131	14,800
Samara	213,253	20,067	—	83	1,050
St. Petersburg	239,748	12,966	2,636	4,161	781
Saratoff	613,445	44,100	—	8	—
Simbirsk	416,873	25,582	—	29	528
Smolensk	709,506	49,014	—	1,518	1,149
Stavropol	13,739	1,733	—	—	—
Tauria (Crimea)	35,642	5,396	—	25	—
Tamboff	665,533	79,474	—	62	16,638
Tver	713,675	41,433	—	—	—
Toula	736,221	66,063	—	3,223	2,636
Kharkoff	379,795	91,247	—	123	—
Kherson.....	260,760	60,490	—	—	—
Tschernigoff	500,000	53,622	—	—	—
Yaroslaw	523,266	28,226	—	5,863	173
Yénisseisk	151	115	—	—	—
Trans-Baikalia	—	11	—	—	—
Irkutsk	—	13	—	—	488
Tobolsk	2,384	616	—	—	149
Tomsk	266	138	—	—	—
Yakoutsk	—	7	—	—	—
Littoral of the Pacific	—	—	—	—	—
Total	20,158,231	1,467,378	354,324	40,554	542,599

* Excluding col. 6, only 6.

† Excluding cols. 5, 6, and taking but cols. 2, 3, 4 (serfs of the

in the RUSSIAN EMPIRE in 1858—Contd.

7	8	9	10	11	12
Total of Serfs.	Number of Proprietors of Serfs.	Average Number of Serfs to each Proprietor.	GENERAL POPULATION.	Percentage of Serfs.	Government or Divisions.
681,672	7,322	93	1,819,110	37·47	Poltawa
380,162	1,952	194	706,462	53·81	Pskoff
806,395	5,215	154	1,427,299	56·50	Riasan
234,453	887	264	1,530,039	15·32	Samara
260,292	1,509	165	1,083,091	24·03	St. Petersburg
657,553	2,592	254	1,636,135	40·19	Saratoff
443,012	1,625	273	1,140,973	38·83	Simbirsk
761,187	5,308	143	1,102,076	69·07	Smolensk
15,472	130	119	640,739	2·41	Stavropol
41,063	396	111	687,343	5·97	Tauria (Crimea)
761,707	3,265	233	1,910,454	39·87	Tamboff
755,108	3,507	215	1,491,427	50·63	Tver
808,143	3,864	209	1,172,249	68·94	Toula
471,165	3,265	144	1,582,571	29·77	Kharkoff
321,250	2,688	119	1,027,459	31·27	Kherson
553,622	4,445	124	1,471,866	37·61	Tschernigoff
557,528	2,810	199	976,866	57·07	Yaroslav
266	5	53	303,266	0·09	Yénisseisk
11	2	6	352,876	0·001	Trans-Baikalia
501	2	250*	319,930	0·16	Irkutsk
3,149	68	46	1,021,266	0·31	Tobolsk
404	27	15	701,001	0·06	Tomsk
7	2	3·50	222,533	0·003	Yakoutsck
—	—	—	21,860	—	Littoral of the Pacific
22,563,086	106,897	211†	61,129,480	36·89	Total

gentry), this per cent. would be only 1·100 (males paying taxes).